



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,097	11/21/2003	Albert J. Stewart	1768.1010-008	1934
21005	7590	05/04/2005	EXAMINER	
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			SWARTHOUT, BRENT	
530 VIRGINIA ROAD			ART UNIT	
P.O. BOX 9133			PAPER NUMBER	
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			2636	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,097

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Brent A. Swarthout

Art Unit

2636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2636

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

a. Claims 1,2 and 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berry, III in view of Markl.

Claims are rejected for the reasons as set forth in the Decision on Appeal mailed 6-20-03 in parent application SN 08/996,567. The only appreciable distinction in the newly filed claims is that voltage on power lines is "repeatedly" changed to control alarms. Since the previous claims taught changing power on power lines to control timing of the alarms, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to repeatedly change power whenever a change in alarm timing was desired. It is conventional in the alarm art that strobing light systems have a light flash more than once when an alarm condition is sensed, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that if a change in power was utilized to control the strobe timing, then plural power changes would have been necessary to have the strobe flash plural times.

Regarding the limitation added pertaining to use in a building alarm system, Berry teaches use in a building alarm system (col.1, lines 21-42).

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent

Art Unit: 2636

and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 11-12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 and 1-3, respectively of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,620 and 6,741,164 in view of Berry, III and Markl. The patented claims recite charging a capacitor to a firing voltage level and maintaining it without activating a strobe in an alarm activation system. It would have been obvious to use such a feature in an alarm activation system as set forth by Berry and Markl in order to allow for simultaneous activation of plural lights.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 and 1-3, respectively of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,620 and 6,741,164 in view of Berry, III, Markl and Tigwell. Claims are satisfied by the combined teachings of the references for the reasons as set forth above in paragraph No. 3 and the reasons as set forth in paragraph No. 2 of the last Office action.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 and 1-3, respectively of U.S. Patent No. 5,886,620 and 6,741,164 in view of Berry, III, Markl, Tigwell and Kollin.

Art Unit: 2636

Claims are satisfied by the combined teachings of the references for the reasons as set forth above in paragraph No. 3 and the reasons as set forth in paragraph No. 3 of the last Office action.

6. Regarding remarks on page 5 of the response filed 1-18-05, applicant states that claims require repeatedly changing voltage after power is supplied to the alarms.

However, in the system as set forth by Berry and Markl, power would have to have been supplied for the alarms to be activated, and subsequently changing the voltage level would have controlled the timing of the alarms.

On page 6 it is stated that Markl is not used in a building. However, Berry teaches alarm synchronization in a building, and it has previously been stated why one of ordinary skill in the art would have wanted to use the synchronization technique of Markl in a system as disclosed by Berry.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of


Art Unit: 2636

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent A Swarthout whose telephone number is 571-272-2979. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Hofsass, can be reached on 571-272-2981. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Brent A Swarthout
Examiner
Art Unit 2636

**BRENT A. SWARTHOUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER**